



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/187,358 11/06/98 MAUER

D GER-5196

PM82/0621

EDWARD D MURPHY
PATENT DEPARTMENT TW 199
THE BLACK & DECKER CORPORATION
701 EAST JOPPA ROAD
TOWSON MD 21286

EXAMINER

BRAHAN, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3652

DATE MAILED:

06/21/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/187,358

Applicant(s)

MAUER

Examiner

Thomas J. Brahan

Group Art Unit

3652



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 6, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 4-14 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

1. Claims 4-14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 4-14 not been further treated on the merits.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with indefinite functional language. For example, at the end of claim 1, the limitation "can be deflected from the head guiding duct against a spring force" fails to positively recite any structure for the recited function. Claims 2 and 3 also discuss "at least one catch element" without indicating that it is the same catch element of claim 1. It is also unclear as to how the applicant is using the term "articulated" as the leaf spring embodiment does not articulate as it does not have a joint.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-3, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Eisenpresser et al. Eisenpresser et al shows a conveying system for a item with a head and shanks with a catch element (22) spring biased into a portion of the head guiding duct. Its engagement surface is a locking face in the transfer region, as recited in claim 2, and it articulates as recited in claim 3.

6. Claims 1-3, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Blacket et al '114. Blacket et al '114 shows a conveying system for a item with a head and a shank having a catch element (29) spring biased into a portion of the head guiding duct. Its engagement surface is a locking face in the transfer region, as recited in claim 2, and it articulates to same degree as applicant's leaf spring articulates, as recited in claim 3.

7. Blacket et al '127, Ito et al, and Feldpausch et al are cited as showing similar catch elements.

8. An inquiry concerning this action should be directed to Examiner Thomas J. Brahan at telephone number (703) 308-2568 on Mondays through Thursdays from 8:30-6:00 EST. The examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski, can be reached at (703) 308-5183. The fax number for Technology Center 3600 is (703) 305-7687.

 6/16/02
THOMAS J. BRAHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER